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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for addressing the reviewers' comments. The revised manuscript is much clearer and the results provide useful evidence on how payment models in primary care can influence service outcomes. I do not have any major concern but it would be good if the discussion could be more balanced to avoid the impression of a bias against the fee-for-service model and in favour of the Family Health Team model. I suggest the following revisions:-

1. Table on the characteristics of the different primary care models should be labeled as Table 1 (instead of Table 4).

2. Line 183-184: Please change the word "risk" to "likelihood" in the sentence "High income.... increased the "risk" of receiving periodic health visits..."

3. Line 186: it would be good if you could add the results on whether, or not, the likelihood of people aged >65 receiving periodic health visits was significantly lower in Capitation or Family Health Team primary care than those attending Fee-for-service primary care. It should also be pointed out that "salary model" was associated with a lower likelihood of periodic health visits across all morbidity groups.

4. Line 217-227, the discussion on the reason why there was relatively few periodic health visits among patients with co-morbidity seems a bit biased. The possibility of "under service" as a result of lack of incentive for PHC in the Capitation and Family Health Team models should be considered.
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